Tacttical Aesthetics: A Propositional Aesthetic Language Starting from Philosophies of Relationality

**Abstract**: Tacttical aesthetics is a propositional aesthetic language for an art that seeks to reinforce and reproduce values present in philosophies of relationality in place of those present in contemporary systems of domination. With this text I present some partial declarations about tacttical aesthetics that draw on Indigenous and feminist philosophies of relationality and on ideas of resingularization. As well as reflecting on the value of neologisms for this type of project, I discuss the various implications for tacttical aesthetics, including its relation to contemporary art and shock tactics, and the double bind that occurs when privileges inherent in contemporary art practices that reproduce or reinforce systems of domination are brought into question. The question that remains relates to how tacttical aesthetics might develop as an art practice.
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The tentacular ones make attachments and detachments; they make cuts and knots; they make a difference; they weave paths and consequences but not determinisms; they are both open and knotted in some ways and not others.

Donna Haraway

Tacttical aesthetics proposes an aesthetic language for art that reinforces and reproduces values associated with philosophies of relationality. This is in place of those associated with what American scholar bell hooks calls the “imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy” or “the interlocking systems that work together to
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uphold and maintain cultures of domination”. To this end, tactitical aesthetics evokes the image of ‘tacking,’ which in sailing involves changing direction while heading into the wind. This article aims to articulate the speculative qualities of these changes in direction for tactitical aesthetics. I start by situating the word ‘aesthetics’ and follow with a discussion about the word ‘tactical.’ I then offer six partial declarations that elaborate on the makings of a tactitical aesthetic.

Concerns associated with the word ‘aesthetic’ have a long history, including some by ancient Greek philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle. However, in the West the word has traditionally been associated with the philosophies of the eighteenth-century Germany, particularly those by Immanuel Kant and his predecessor Alexander Baumgarten, who is credited for creating the word from the Greek aesthanomai or aesthetiki. Kant defined aesthetics as the experiences art evinces for those who engage with it, particularly those experiences that are difficult or impossible to understand in concrete terms but can be understood in terms of ‘judgements.’ According to Kant, these aesthetic judgements are subjective, based on feelings or sensations, and require a certain critical distance to see and understand. Kant’s aesthetic judgements frame how we understand aesthetics today; firstly, as a study of the concerns of artists in the creation of artwork, secondly, as a study of how artwork is received by and affects viewers, and finally as a tool for cultural expression and social cohesion.

Tactitical aesthetics acknowledges these framings of aesthetic judgements, particularly the way they adhere and become specific aesthetic languages. An aesthetic language is a form of communication using specific forms or styles of expression that speak to a particular concern which might be technical, political, religious, cultural and so on. Some examples are the identifiable style of Japanese manga, or of central Australian Aboriginal abstract paintings, or of American minimalism. Each has its own unique combination of aesthetics that forms a language that can be used to speak for the concerns of those who employ it. Tactitical aesthetics has the ambition of becoming an aesthetic language. If it succeeds it will have created its own unique combination of aesthetics including methodologies for creating and engaging with a tactitical art that, in its aim to reinforce or reproduce the Indigenous and feminist philosophies of relationality, will be constantly in flux and indeterminate.

The word ‘tactical’ is tactical. Although the recent history of the word ‘tactical’ has military associations, it comes from the Greek taktike techne which means the ‘art of arrangement’ and taktikos ‘of or pertaining to arrangement.’ You can see this meaning in our contemporary word ‘taxonomy.’ Tactitical aesthetics is a tactic and not a strategy. The distinction Michel de Certeau makes between actions that are tactics and
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actions that are strategies is useful here. For Certeau, a tactic has no “proper locus” and is determined by an absence of power, and a strategy is the opposite – it comes from a relationship of power to place. Tacttical aesthetics has no strategic power (except that which is in this very acknowledgement) because it has no proper locus. Its suggestive locus is in the concept of relationality, which is also where its absence of singular power lies. This tactic of tacttical aesthetics operates by either metaphorically or literally tacking things together in a temporary arrangement. Such as in the way two pieces of fabric might be tacked together, so they can be sewn together more permanently at a later stage, or easily detached. What might keep them together or draw them apart remains uncertain.

**Tacttical aesthetics is a concept and therefore a tool**

Tacttical aesthetics is a concept in the sense developed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari in their book *What is Philosophy?* and elaborated on by Australian philosopher Elizabeth Grosz in her essay “The Future of Feminist Theory”. Grosz works to define theory in order to determine what the future of feminist theory might be. She aligns theory with Deleuze and Guattari’s idea of the ‘concept’ and situates that idea of the concept within the developing trajectory of the cosmos. She says concepts are tools that help us to address and deal with the chaos that surrounds us. For Grosz, practice needs theory to generate the new, to overcome “the weight of the present,” and to transform. Understanding tacttical aesthetics as a concept means seeing it as a way of thinking through the forces that act on contemporary life in order to comprehend a future that is different from the present. Thinking a new concept might enable tacttical aesthetics to operate outside the systems of domination.

**Tacttical aesthetics is led by philosophies of relationality**

In a conversation on racism in Australian society, Australian Goenpul scholar Aileen Moreton-Robinson said, “if you see yourself as part of me and I’m part of you, if we have that relationship then, you know, we can move together.”
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inson’s invitation to see yourself as part of me and me as part of you is a radical and ethical suggestion for overcoming racism. She talks about this form of relationality in *Talkin’ Up to the White Woman*, “In Indigenous cultural domains relationality means that one experiences the self as part of others and that others are part of the self; this is learnt through reciprocity, obligation, shared experiences, coexistence, cooperation and social memory.” Tacitical aesthetics might not be able to exist outside of this mode of seeing you as part of me, and me as part of you. The question of how to create art that enacts “reciprocity, obligation, shared experience, coexistence, cooperation and social memory” without participating in the systems of domination is the core question for tacitical aesthetics. To this extent, tacitical aesthetics are tacky because they are sticky. They look to a sticky relationality for form and function.

The profound and inerasable interconnectedness that Moreton-Robinson’s articulation of an Indigenous relationality evokes is also present in the feminist thinking of French-Israeli psychoanalyst and artist Bracha Ettinger. Ettinger draws on, and against, the work of key psychoanalysts including Sigmund Freud, Jacques Lacan and Julia Kristeva to devise relational ways of thinking across difference. Her central feminist psychoanalytic theory of subjectivity, which she calls ‘matrixial’, is based on the mother-infant relationship in the late stages of pregnancy when both selves are part of each other. Ettinger calls the indeterminate psychic space between the mother and unborn infant a borderspace. It models a place where the idea of subjectivity pertaining to a single, unique individual is called into question. Here, for Ettinger, subjectivities are partly joined and therefore jointly responsible for each other, indicating the ethical component of her thinking. For Ettinger, a borderspace can be an aesthetic encounter making it a valuable site for tacitical aesthetics and the generation of tactical art projects. Moreton-Robinson’s quote, “If you see yourself as part of me and I’m part of you, if we have that relationship then […] we can move together” metaphorically models the borderspace for tacitical aesthetics and proposes a locus for aesthetics as an ethical encounter.

**Tacitical aesthetics embraces neologisms**

‘Borderspace’ is one of many neologisms Ettinger creates to help her readers imagine the world as a feminist relational world. These neologisms enable Ettinger to articulate the complex relationship that evolves during late stage pregnancy. Some examples include: *metramorphosis, extimacy, wit(h)nessing, severality, com-passion, archaic-becoming-m/Other-to-be, coemergence, corpo-reality, copoiesis, phantasmatic, co-response-ability, co-poietic, co-emergence, fascinance,* and there are many others.13
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According to British scholar Griselda Pollock, Ettinger’s neologisms bend “the phallicism of language.”¹⁴ These neologisms help the reader to think beyond the standard meanings of conventional words. A hyphen here, some brackets there, a merging of two words, and new meanings, new possibilities, new ways of relating are created. In its own novel formulation, a collision of ‘tack’ and ‘tactical,’ tacktical aesthetics creates its own new way of relating.

American scholar Tressie McMillan Cottom noted the importance of language creation as a form of resistance. She said, “I think how scary it is that we cannot imagine another way of living […] I suspect that the answer is in a language we haven’t written yet. Which is why in times of extreme political violence and oppression art does become so very important because it does help a community articulate a way of understanding the world that allows them to reimagine it, rather than reproducing it. […] I don’t know the right answers, I do know that it doesn’t come from the language that we already have available to us.”¹⁵ This type of thinking about language is vital to tacktical aesthetics because it is through the creation of new language that new concepts can not only come into existence but can work beyond the current paradigm.

**Tacktical aesthetics does not use shock tactics**

Tacktical aesthetics does not use ‘shock tactics’ which are a common feature of contemporary art and politics. Shock tactics were arguably used to greatest effect in Australia by artist Mike Parr in his piece *Cathartic action: social gestus No. 5* (1977). In this piece, Parr attached a realistic prosthetic limb stuffed with meat to his congenitally short arm and proceeded to hack it off with an axe in front of an audience. In her essay on the ethical value of producing discomfort through art, Australian artist and scholar Barbara Bolt writes that “as the lifeless arm lay on the table a profound shock registered in the gathered crowd.”¹⁶ Bolt notes how Jean-François Lyotard’s 1984 essay “The Sublime and the Avant-Garde” makes the case that shock “provides the foundations of the transformative power of art.”¹⁷ Lyotard paralleled the shock required to achieve the effect of the sublime—the intangible, momentary, awesome effect of art—with ‘hypercapitalism.’¹⁸ He says that in the search for more “intense effects” the arts test their limits with shock, “Shock is, *par excellence*, the evidence of (something) happening, rather than nothing at all.”¹⁹ Lyotard sees the sublime in both the capitalist
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Economy and the spirit of the moment, “Sublimity no longer is in art, but in speculating on art.” Social activist Naomi Klein made explicit neoliberalism’s use of shock to further its own agenda in her book *The Shock Doctrine*. Tacttical aesthetics does not employ shock tactics because, following Klein and Lyotard’s logic, doing so mirrors and reinforces what bell hooks calls the “imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy.”

For Lyotard the question *Is it happening?* is the opposite of shock and of innovation, both of which he claims propel capitalism. In comparison to the question ‘what is happening?’ the question *Is it happening?* has no specific answer and can leave one feeling somewhat confused about what it is referring to or what is going on more generally. It invokes a paucity of experience, which could be understood as a ‘lack’ in psychoanalytic terms. Elaborating on Jacques Lacan’s recognition of the mother as ‘lack,’ Ettinger says we search for a ‘lack aspect,’ that is separated, fragmented, and lost. She says this “lacking something is not just any no-thing! It is a particular nothing.” These psychoanalytic readings of ‘lack’ echo the relational and feminist qualities of tacttical aesthetics – these immaterial relations that are not something, not something that can answer the question ‘what is happening?’ but are also not nothing – relations that inspire the question *Is it happening?* but can’t answer it. From a more vernacular perspective, this lack is in opposition to the ‘rich’ experience of contemporary art which feels edifying, acculturating, satisfying. Tacttical aesthetics does not provide those kinds of experiences. In this sense, tacttical aesthetics might also be tacky, like a horse of little value and exemplify American scholar Jack Halberstam’s “low theory” which is a way of thinking about, and giving power to, alternative forms of knowledge production.

**Tacttical aesthetics finds itself in a double bind**

Tacttical aesthetics is evolving out of a desire to question the privileges inherent in contemporary art practices that reproduce or reinforce the systems of domination. When the desire for racial justice is confronted with an inability to accept change, a “psychological dissonance” in the form of a double bind emerges. The term ‘double bind,’ defined by British anthropologist Gregory Bateson refers to what might appear to be an ethical or philosophical paradox but is really an ‘unresolvable sequence of
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experience’ and ‘a situation in which no matter what a person does, they can’t win.26 Using white privilege to question white privilege or addressing and critiquing and somehow trying to come to terms with the privilege of the institutions that enable art practices creates a double bind. For me, the privilege of being white and middle-class is undeniable and always there. Bateson obtains the idea of the double bind indirectly from the work of American cultural anthropologist Margaret Mead. Mead presents, in Bateson’s words, what “may appear to be an ethical or philosophical paradox, a suggestion that we discard purpose in order to achieve our purpose.”27 This tells me that with tactical aesthetics my double bind is present in two ways. Firstly, following Mead’s definition, I am using my white privilege to question white privilege. And secondly, I am addressing and critiquing and somehow trying to come to terms with the privileges of all the institutions that enable my practice as an artist and an academic and that are complicit in the maintenance of systems of domination.

Australian scholar Sara Ahmed says the double bind describes how the white person is left in a state of confusion about what to do, all the while knowing that “doing” is not what needs to be done. Moreton-Robinson also reflects upon that desire “to do something” which is common with white people. She relates the story of a well-intentioned white, female scholar who asks her what she can do to help further the effort of Aboriginal rights and sovereignty. Moreton-Robinson responds with a very provocative question: *What are the limits to what you would do?*28 It’s not difficult to imagine the well-intentioned scholar thinking: I could write an email, I could write an article, I could edit a book, I could organize a symposium … but the question also asks: *What could you do that wouldn’t reinforce your own privilege?* For Moreton-Robinson, the question of ‘what to do’ is, in itself, an assertion of privilege. Politicians or the media evoke an image of handwringing when people of privilege are in a state of confusion about what to do about their privilege. Understanding the double bind and its implications can assuage the predisposition to handwringing and possibly inspire alternative responses.

In a number of her publications, but particularly in her book *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization*, Indian scholar Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak elaborates on Bateson’s ‘double bind.’29 For Spivak, double binds are an experience, and are more akin to an aporia than a paradox, “it is not a logical or philosophical problem, like a contradiction, a dilemma, a paradox, an antimony.”30 All the same, double binds have paradoxical outcomes. In order to be exited, or resolved, or dissolved (whatever the correct word is) they must have paradoxical outcomes. For example, the Italian scholar Franco ‘Bifo’ Berardi suggests that the paradoxical solution for progress in
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and out of a neoliberal era is to accept and embrace its antithesis: decline. “Decline (reverse growth) implies a divestment from the frenzy of competition: this is the paradoxical path that may bring us out of neoliberalism’s double bind.” Berardi’s language is useful for tactical aesthetics: in order to produce something, one must not produce anything, or perhaps one must rethink what it means to produce something, or what is produced should not actually be something. Ideas of not producing, divestment and decline are useful when considering institutions and power structures that, wilfully or not, reinforce or reproduce privilege.

Spivak talks about the double bind as a site of productivity and responsibility. While my instinct is to look for an exit out of this double bind, she encourages me to sit within it as an act of critical work before attempting any move. Tactical aesthetics then is developed out of time spent within the double bind. It taps into the affective effect of realizing and acknowledging the double bind, the handwringing, the aporia, the questioning, the anxiety, the desires and the awkwardness it evokes. Spivak also says that sitting in the double bind should not be an act of occupation. As American scholars Eve Tuck and K Wayne Yang indicate, occupation’s relationship to colonialism is not just in the past. It is also evident in contemporary political practices such as the Occupy movement which they see as “another settler re-occupation on stolen land.” For this reason, tactical aesthetics is situated in, but does not occupy, a double bind. Being in the double bind means that however tactical aesthetics manifests, it will not settle, it will not become a thing.

**Tactical aesthetics, as a relational concept, embraces resingularization**

While tactical aesthetics does not intend to be something or to do something, in its effort to embrace Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s proposal that I see myself as part of you and you as part of me, tactical aesthetics cannot help but contradict those intentions. Tactical aesthetics might function as what Erin Manning and Brian Massumi call a “technique of relation” which they describe as a device “for catalyzing and modulating interaction […] as part of a larger ‘ethics of engagement.’” It might also offer different possibilities for rethinking our physical and psychical selves, enabling us to resingularize. This means thinking and *rethinking* the ways we are ordered or
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interpellated into the world, and for artists, the ways we are ordered or interpellated into the world by contemporary art, and the way contemporary artists and academics, order and interpellate others into systems of domination through our practices.\(^\text{37}\) In *The Three Ecologies*, Félix Guattari associates the contemporary lack of singularization, a kind of relational thinking, with the end of human history. “We need new social and aesthetic practices, new practices of the Self in relation to the other, to the foreign, the strange – a whole programme that seems far removed from current concerns.”\(^\text{38}\) British-Israeli scholar Irit Rogoff says this is a way of “coming together and producing relations and agendas that do not emanate from shared identities, shared ideologies, shared belief systems.”\(^\text{39}\) And in unexpected proximity to Moreton-Robinson’s expression of relationality, Guattari calls for a “re-singularizing of subjectivity.” When he suggests that this “ethico-political option” is not “inscribed in history” perhaps he means it is not inscribed in *Western* history.\(^\text{40}\)

From the early 1990s European philosophy began to find its own language for the kind of relationality Moreton-Robinson and other First Nation philosophers recognize as always being a part of their lives.\(^\text{41}\) Moreton-Robinson conceptualizes relationality as axiological, ontological and epistemological. She says this paradigm is informed by the embodied connection Indigenous people have to their country, to all living entities and to their ancestors.\(^\text{42}\) She acknowledges other First Nation scholars have discussed similar paradigms with similar terms, such as Cree scholar Shawn Wilson and Noonuccal scholar Karen Martin who uses the word ‘relatedness’.\(^\text{43}\) Karen Martin has researched words that other scholars have used for the same concept, Bardi scholar Pat Dudgeon and Malgana scholar Darlene Oxenham call this ‘kindredness’ and Nyungar scholar Simon Forrest names it ‘connectedness’ .\(^\text{44}\) While much work has been done over the past decades by Western philosophers to put language to a sense of connection between and beyond humans, First Nation peoples (not just the scholars or philosophers) have lived that connection and have always had their own language for it.


Here I have presented tacttical aesthetics as an initial formulation for an aesthetic language that aims to produce art without reinforcing or reproducing systems of domination. As it tacks into this wind, tacttical aesthetics learns from the sticky qualities of Indigenous and feminist philosophies of relationality to produce relations that are not based on identities, ideologies or belief systems. In this movement, tacttical aesthetics acknowledges the double bind it finds itself in and the “particular nothing” that it needs to be. How to practice this tacttical aesthetics is the question that remains.
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